

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO†

EXCERPTS FROM OUR STATE MEDICAL JOURNAL

Vol. X, No. 3, March, 1912

From Some Editorial Notes:

Do Men Think?—Do such prominent men as William J. Mayo, George W. Crile, A. J. Ochsner, J. H. Carstens, E. Fletcher Ingalls, and others, who contributed articles to the January number of the *American Journal of Surgery*, give the slightest thought to what they are doing by so contributing? It would seem to be impossible that men of that character, men who have worked as hard as a number of these gentlemen have worked for the up-building of the American Medical Association can really understand what it means when they give their support to a publication that represents the very extreme of "published for profit" medical (?) journalism. The advertising pages of the publication in question are full of the very worst fake and fraudulent nostrum advertisements that ever were. And yet men of distinction in the medical world will help that nefarious business along by contributing articles to such a sheet! The *Journal of the American Medical Association*, in December last [December, 1911], called attention to the nostrums advertised in the publication under discussion and deplored the fact that reputable men would contribute articles to such a publication or subscribe to it. And that is the gist of the whole matter. . . .

The Press and Patent Medicine.—We howl a lot about the outrageousness of the newspapers in printing advertisements of quacks, cancer cures and patent medicines of all sorts, but are we very much better than they? Look through the advertising pages of the *New York Medical Journal*, the *Medical Record*, the *Annals of Surgery*, for example, and see what you think is the difference between our own publication and the daily press! There is mighty little, when you come to study it. . . .

Quality of Papers.—At various times, during the past ten years, there has been some discussion as to the quality of the scientific papers published in the *State Journal*. The comment of the editor has always been that the papers published in the official *Journal* reflect the productivity of the physicians in the State and their attitude toward their fellows in the State and toward the *State Journal*. . . . It all comes back to the original contention—the *State Journal* is just what the members of the Society make it. If they write and contribute good papers, then the scientific tone of the *Journal* is good; if they do not do this, then it is lower than it should be. Let us always have criticism, for it is good for anyone; but let us also be sure that we understand what we are criticizing and why. It is up to the members of the Society.

Publicity Campaign.—Probably only a few even of those who are deeply interested in the American Medical Association have any very clear idea of the enormous amount of work directly affecting the medical profession and the public that the Association is doing. This particular word of comment relates to only one of the various large and important activities of the Association—its press bureau for the education of the public on public health matters. . . .

Notice Preliminary Program.—Forty-second annual meeting of the Medical Society of the State of California. Del Monte Hotel, Del Monte, April 16, 17, and 18, 1912. Railroad rates the same as usual; one and one-third fare for the round trip. . . .

(Continued in Front Advertising Section, Page 17)

†This column strives to mirror the work and aims of colleagues who bore the brunt of Association work some twenty-five years ago. It is hoped that such presentation will be of interest to both old and new members.

BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA†

By CHARLES B. PINKHAM, M.D.
Secretary-Treasurer

Board Proceedings

At a regular meeting of the Board of Medical Examiners held at Independent Foresters' Hall, 1329 South Hope Street, Los Angeles, February 8 to 11, inclusive, the following changes in the status of licentiates were made:

Edward H. Anthony, Los Angeles, placed on probation for three years without narcotic privileges.

Robert V. Baker, Los Angeles, guilty of violation of probation; penalty deferred until the July meeting.

James H. Beggs, Oakland (conviction, Pacific Coast Abortion Ring), license revoked.

Francis James Bold, Montebello, license restored and placed on probation for five years.

Samuel D. Burgeson, Jr., Los Angeles, placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

John E. Cummings, Los Angeles, dismissed without prejudice.

Merton E. Eastman, Oakland, placed on probation for three years.

Thomas Flint, Redding, license revoked.

James Harvey Johnston, San Francisco, placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

John Lenz, Redondo Beach, license restored and placed on probation for five years.

Ramon Lopez, Brawley, license restored and placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

Leroy J. Otis, Norwalk, guilty; placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

Allen H. Peek, Ventura, guilty; placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

Byron H. Pelton, Compton, license restored and placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

Jesse C. Ross, San Francisco (conviction, Pacific Coast Abortion Ring), license revoked.

Alfred Henry Valentine St. John, Los Angeles (conviction, Pacific Coast Abortion Ring), license revoked.

Leo Morton Schulman, Los Angeles, license revoked.

Henry C. Wallace, Fresno, guilty; placed on probation for five years without narcotic privileges.

George E. Watts, Los Angeles (conviction, Pacific Coast Abortion Ring), license revoked.

Glenn Granger White, San Diego, guilty; license revoked.

Carlisle B. Wiley, Los Angeles, license revoked.

News

"X-ray negatives, although paid for by patients, are the property of physicians. Municipal Judge Alfred J. Fritz so ruled yesterday in an unique case brought against Dr. Robert A. Ostroff by two patients, S. M. Wilzen and his wife, Peggy. 'It is a matter of common knowledge that x-ray negatives are practically meaningless to the layman. Their retention by the physician or surgeon constitutes an important part of his clinical record,' held Judge Fritz, denying Mr. and Mrs. Wilzen possession of x-rays taken by Doctor Ostroff." (San Francisco Examiner, February 12, 1937.)

"The United States Circuit Court of Appeals in San Francisco refused jurisdiction in the case of three naturopaths of Hawthorne, California, who were seeking to halt enforcement of the California Medical Practice Act. Arthur O., Ray, and Jack Borland brought suit first in the State court against Los Angeles County officials and officers of Inglewood Township, asking that they be enjoined from enforcing the Act and from refusing to permit them

(Continued in Front Advertising Section, Page 23)

†The office addresses of the California State Board of Medical Examiners are printed in the roster on advertising page 6.